

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. As will be discussed in detail below, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ukai (US 4,810,060) in view of Tang et al. (US 5,684,365) ("Tang"). For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Claims 1, 2, and 10-12 include the following limitation: "a driving thin film transistor (TFT) connected to said self-emissive element for supplying a drive current to said self-emissive element." The combination of Ukai and Tang do not teach or suggest that limitation.

The Examiner asserts that "Ukai teaches that the size of the driving TFT in a display pixel for one color is altered from that in a display pixel of another color." The Examiner also asserts that Tang teaches a self-emissive element for emitting light of a predetermined color and a driving thin film transistor (TFT) connected to the self-emissive element for supplying a drive current to the self-emissive element. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to combine the two references. Applicant respectfully traverses.

First, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion as to the teachings of the references. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the pixel circuit of Ukai has a switching TFT, but does not have a driving TFT. On the other hand, the pixel circuit of Tang has both a switching TFT and a driving TFT. The switching TFT of Ukai has similar functions to that of Tang's switching TFT. Thus, the structure for the switching TFT of Ukai may be adapted to that of Tang, but not to the driving TFT. Furthermore, driving TFTs provide a current to an EL element and switching TFTs provide a voltage to a LC element (in Ukai) or a gate of a driving TFT (in Tang); thus, functions of switching TFT and a driving TFT are quite different from each other and it is not possible to readily adapt the structures of the switching TFT of

Ukai to the driving TFT of Tang. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine Ukai and Tang.

Moreover, Tang specifically teaches that the TFT-EL panel has two important advantages in terms of power requirements over the TFT LCD panels. Tang then goes on to discuss the advantages. See column 11, line 66 to column 12, line 12. This statement would suggest that one skilled in the art would not combine the Tang reference with a LCD reference. While the Examiner seems to suggest that such a statement provides motivation to combine, Applicant cannot see how such a statement provides support for combining Tang with a LCD reference, such as Ukai.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 2, and 10-12 are patentable over Ukai and Tang.

Claims 3-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ukai in view of Tang and further in view of Rumbaugh (US 6,072,272). Claims 3-9 include the following limitation: "a driving thin film transistor (TFT) connected to said self-emissive element for supplying a drive current to said self-emissive element." As explained above, Ukai and Tang do not teach or suggest that limitation and Rumbaugh does not remedy that deficiency. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.


Claims 13-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ukai in view of Tang, in view of Rumbaugh, and further in view of Codama (US 6,121,726). Claims 13-18 include the following limitation: "a driving thin film transistor (TFT) connected to said self-emissive element for supplying a drive current to said self-emissive element." As explained above, Ukai and Tang do not teach or suggest that limitations and Rumbaugh and Codama do not remedy the deficiency. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Lisa A. Bongiovi

Registration No. 48,933

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone (860) 286-2929

Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 23413

October 21, 2003

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 22 2003

OFFICIAL